

SECTION '3' – Applications recommend for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT

Application No : 16/00030/FULL6

Ward:
West Wickham

Address : 21 Boleyn Gardens West Wickham BR4
9NG

OS Grid Ref: E: 537835 N: 165510

Applicant : Mrs Ayse Bolsoy

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Conversion of loft to form habitable space
RETROSPECTIVE

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 51

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a hip to gable end extension and rear dormer.

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property located on Boleyn Gardens, West Wickham.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- o The proposed elevation alterations and extensions are out of character with the surroundings and do not respect the host dwelling rendering the proposals contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the UDP, adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) No.2 Residential Design Guidance and paragraph 58 of the NPPF
- o The dormer window constructed is not of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and therefore is contrary to policy H8 of the UDP
- o The addition of the dormer window to the edge of the roof line will allow unacceptable overlooking of the rear gardens of Nos. 19 and 23 and will therefore impact on the amenity of their occupiers, contrary to policy BE1 of the UDP

- o The roof extensions and elevations are not in keeping with the surrounding properties and show no respect to the original property or the existing dwellings in the neighbourhood
- o The loft conversion and extension is vertical and extends fully over the second floor extension, this impacts massively on our property (19) as the extension height is excessive and detrimental to the property and out of character with properties in the area
- o A slope to the roof extension would lessen the impact on our property
- o The dormer window extends to the edge of the roof line and is not of a size or design appropriate to the roofscape contrary to policy H8 of the UDP.
- o The additional dormer window to the edge of the roofline impacts on the privacy for adjoining properties and gardens
- o The roof side extension and gable end extend beyond the original wall of the dwelling and over the original 1st floor extension above the garage roof
- o This is not subservient to the main dwelling and by reason of the incongruous and unsatisfactory design of the roof is detrimental to the visual amenity of the host building, street scene and character of the area contrary to policies H8 and BE1 of the UDP, SPG, and paragraph 58 of the NPPF.
- o The extreme size of the dormer is imposing to all neighbours, and due to the angle of the house against its boundary line, which is an invasion to those living at 19 Boleyn Gardens
- o The drawings are incorrect and do not show an additional window that has been installed on the rear elevation
- o Granting permission for the application would set a precedent for future development within Bromley
- o There has been no consultation between the developer and the owner of the neighbouring properties
- o I wish to object to this planning application (No.19), as it is incomplete, inaccurate, invasion of the privacy of neighbouring properties, insensitive to the architecture of the local area not in line with the UDP
- o The dormer is very large and covers the full width of the extended property
- o It is well in excess of others dormers built in the area and, accordingly has had an impact on our privacy (No.23)
- o If permitted will be detrimental to the local area and set a precedent for the future
- o The size of the dormer is well in excess of other dormers that have been built in the area and therefore adversely impacted our privacy (No.23)
- o The loft conversion is an overdevelopment for the size of the house
- o The side of the extension is vertical and extends fully across the second floor extension; there is no slope to the roof on this side of the extension which is impacting our neighbour at 19
- o The owners of 7 Boleyn Gardens submitted a planning application DC/14/00788/FULL6 for very similar development and this was rejected on the basis that the part one/two storey side extension would be subservient to the main dwelling and by reason of the incongruous and unsatisfactory design of the roof would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the host building, street scene and character
- o It is unacceptable that planning laws have been manipulated in a way that can lead to chaos if this type of application is approved

- o We were astonished that works was commenced without planning permission having been sought or obtained
- o It seems disingenuous that plans for a large second storey rear extension have been submitted separately from the ground floor extension both of which have already been substantially completed
- o It would be more appropriate to consider the ground and second floor extensions together
- o The roof extension has been built to the top of the roofline and extended across to the flank of the building without any slope to the roof, from the plans this equates to doubling each front areas of roof
- o There are no other extensions in the locality which have been completed in this way and the building does stick out like a sore thumb
- o The second floor extension dominates the sightline when we are in our garden (No.17) and it does feel like an inappropriate encroachment given it is dissimilar in size from the rear
- o The area is predominately 3/4 bedroom semi-detached houses which maintain their feel from when originally constructed, the extension of this large proportion materially changes this 'feel', together with making us feel very overlooked- almost as if a commercial development has landed near us (No.17)
- o Submitting separate planning applications for one overall development disguises the true size and scale of this huge extension of the living accommodation of 21 Boleyn Gardens
- o The total development greatly exceeds 50% of the floor area of the original house
- o The rear extension exceeds 3m in length from the original house
- o The garage has been converted to accommodation reducing off street car parking, no parking provision for off street parking is being made in proportion to the vastly increased living accommodation - This does not relate to the current application
- o The rear dormer is far larger than others in the vicinity, extending the full width of the original house and flush with the original rear wall unlike other neighbouring dormers, which have been set back from the rear wall and boundary
- o The effect of this is that it is obtrusive, overpowering and an invasion of privacy for those neighbours who live nearby
- o The distance from the boundary for a double storey extension is much less than 1 metre limit
- o The extension would result in a loss of light, overshadowing, loss of privacy and overlooking to surrounding properties
- o The layout and density of the building is far in excess of that normally found in the area
- o The first floor extension is unsightly and out of keeping with the rest of the road, the rear view looks like a block of flats
- o The number of people likely to live there will also overwhelm the local roads and parking spaces
- o The size of the first floor extension is totally out of character with the extensions that have been carried out over the years in Boleyn Gardens

- o The extension does not comply with planning law, the side extension of the storey extension extends the full length of the house and clearly overhangs the outer face of the wall of the original house
- o The roof extension is detrimental to the visual amenity, streetcare and character of the area, contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the UDP
- o The blank elevation to the side of the house has no pitch and out of character to the rest of the houses in the street and is unsightly
- o The large roof extension is now an invasion of the privacy of those in Highfield Drive, Boleyn Gardens and Oakfield Avenue
- o Total lack of regard for proper processes and consideration for the area, neighbours and planning processes
- o We now have a monstrous development, as a result of which we now have no privacy in our back garden (No.25)
- o The building has gone on with little, if any, regards to planning laws
- o The extension is neither in keeping with the area or sympathetic
- o This extension was started at the same time as the ground floor work and should therefore be viewed as one application
- o There was no formal consultation period prior to the work being carried out, as laid down in the LBB planning regulations, the owners have clearly not followed any planning rules
- o The proposed elevations showing the rear of the property do not correspond with the elevations actually built both in form and also in the number, sizes and arrangements of windows and rooflights
- o This application for retrospective planning permission should be considered in conjunction with the previous application ref no: (15/05149/FULL6). This in total is a gross over development and out keeping with other properties in the area. The gable end overshadows adjacent properties.

It is noted that the objections comments relating to the Single storey front, side and rear extensions (DC/15/05149/FULL6) will not be considered a material consideration in regards to the current application, as this application has already been determined.

The Council received amended plans on the 01/03/2016.

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

SPG1- General Design Guidance
 SPG2- Residential Design Guidance

BE1 Design of New Development
 H8 Residential Extensions

Planning History

15/05149/FULL6-Single storey front, side and rear extensions (Retrospective Application)-Permitted- This application was considered by the Plans Sub-Committee held on the 4th February 2016.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

Development in Principle

The application seeks planning permission for a hip to gable end roof extension and rear dormer. As noted above this application does not include the retrospective planning application for the 15/05149/FULL6 for a single storey front, side and rear extensions, which was permitted on the 11/02/2016.

Members may consider that the proposed development as a whole is compliant with Policies BE1 and H8 of the UDP. The proposed scale, form and materials would respect the amenities of the surrounding properties and the character of the area and that of the host dwelling.

Design

Policies H8, BE1 and the Council's Supplementary design guidance seek to ensure that new development, including residential extensions are of a high quality design that respects the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development.

The main concerns raised by the submitted objections appears to be in relation to the hip to gable element, which extends the whole way across the roof line, with a vertical appearance along the eastern elevation. Objections have stated the proposal is out of keeping with the surrounding area and does not confirm with the character of the host dwelling.

However, it is considered that the overall design, size and proportions of the proposal are considered on balance acceptable and in keeping with the design of the existing dwelling and compatible with the surrounding area. Policy H8 of the UDP states that roof alterations with dormer extensions above the existing ridgeline will not normally be permitted. Despite the extension extending the whole way across the roof line, the extension does not exceed the existing ridgeline. Furthermore, there are many examples in the locality where properties have extended into the roof and incorporated a gable end roof design. As a result it is considered, that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the existing street scene and is compatible with surrounding properties.

Amenities

Policy BE1 of the UDP requires the Council to consider whether planning proposals will significantly affect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties and any future occupiers, ensuring that their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing. It is considered that the development would not unduly harm the amenities of the neighbouring properties at 19 and 23 Boleyn Gardens or have any effect to the amenities of the properties along Oaklands Avenue to the rear of the host property.

It was noted on the site visit that a large number of properties along Boleyn Gardens benefit from rear dormers. In addition, the host dwelling benefits from a substantial garden. Taking this into account it is considered that there would be no loss of amenity to the properties to the rear of the host dwelling along Oaklands Avenue.

The main concern of the proposal is the potential loss of amenities to the two neighbouring properties at 19 and 23, who have both objected to the proposal. Both neighbours have highlighted that the development would result in unacceptable level of overlooking of both rear gardens. Furthermore the size of the dormer and angle of the host dwelling is considered imposing.

Although it is acknowledged that the rear dormer is bigger than other dormers in the surrounding area, it is considered that overlooking has already been established and given the density of the built environment there would not be a loss of privacy to either neighbouring properties or any other properties along Boleyn Gardens. As a result it is considered that the occupants of neighbouring properties and any future occupants will continue to enjoy a high level of amenity.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor would the development unduly affect the character of the area.

as amended by documents received on 01.03.2016

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

2 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be as set out in the planning application forms and / or drawings unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.